

Serial No.: 10/624,165

Filing Date: 7/21/2003

Attorney Docket No. 100.554US01

Title: PERIODIC EVENT EXECUTION CONTROL MECHANISM

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on May 29, 2007 has been reviewed, along with the art cited. Claims 1, 4-5, 9, 12, 13, 17 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-23 are pending in this application.

Drawings

It is noted that Office Action Summary notes that the drawings are objected to. However, the Office Action provides no basis for the objection to the drawings.

In this regard, it is noted that formal drawings have been submitted herewith but that the drawings do not include any amendments since no basis for the drawing objection was provided.

It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 4-5, 12-13, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4-5, 12-13, and 20 have been amended to address this rejection. It is respectfully submitted that there is no antecedent basis issue with claim 21 since the phrase noted in the Office Action is not used in claim 21. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant admitted prior art in the specification, pages 1 and 2. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In order to expedite prosecution and to provide clarification, Applicant has amended claim 1 of the present application to recite, in part, “distributing the execution of the services associated with that periodic event throughout a next periodic interval of time associated with that periodic event following the occurrence of that periodic event”.

It is respectfully submitted that in now way do paragraphs [0003]-[0004] of the specification of the present application describe this feature of claim 1. Those paragraphs are as follows:

[0003] For example, in one approach, a clock or timer sends an interrupt after each clock tick. An interrupt handler executes a periodic event scheduler. The periodic event scheduler determines which services should be executed in response to that clock tick. For example, in one example, a first set of services is executed after every tick (where a tick is generated every 100 milliseconds), while a second set of services is executed every second (that is, every 10 clock ticks). The periodic event scheduler maintains a counter for the second set of services to count the number of ticks that have occurred since the second set of services was last executed. This is done to determine when one second (the period for this type of periodic event) has elapsed since the second set of services was last executed.

[0004] In such an example, when an interrupt is generated to signal that a tick has elapsed, an interrupt handler executes the periodic event scheduler. The periodic event scheduler determines that the first set of services is to be executed (because the first set is executed for every tick). The periodic event scheduler initiates execution of all the services in the first set at the beginning of the current 100 millisecond period. If the counter indicates that a second has elapsed since the second set of services was last executed, the periodic event scheduler initiates execution of all the services in the second set, also at the beginning of the current 100 millisecond period.

In this regard, it is noted that underlined portions of the cited paragraphs clearly describe an approach that is the opposite of “distributing the execution of the services associated with that periodic event throughout a next periodic interval of time associated with that periodic event following the occurrence of that periodic event” as recited in claim 1 of the present application. That is, the cited portion of the specification indicate that the

execution of the services occurs at the beginning of the next interval and is not distributed throughout the next period interval.

Claims 2-8 all depend from claim 1 and therefore at least those arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply these claims as well.

In order to expedite prosecution and to provide clarification, Applicant has amended claim 9 in a similar manner as claim 1. Since the Office Action used similar reasoning to reject independent claim 9 as it did to reject claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that at least the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply to claim 9 as well.

Claims 10-16 all depend from claim 9 and therefore at least those arguments set forth above with respect to claim 9 apply these claims as well.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 17-23 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art in the specification, pages 1 and 2, in view of Palazzi III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,379,421). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In order to expedite prosecution and to provide clarification, Applicant has amended claim 17 in a similar manner as claim 1. Since the Office Action used similar reasoning to reject independent claim 17 as it did to reject claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that at least the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply to claim 17 as well.

Claims 18-23 all depend from claim 17 and therefore at least those arguments set forth above with respect to claim 17 apply these claims as well.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/624,165

Filing Date: 7/21/2003

Attorney Docket No. 100.554US01

Title: PERIODIC EVENT EXECUTION CONTROL MECHANISM

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims **1-23** are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2007-08-29

/Jon M. Powers/
Jon M. Powers
Reg. No. 43868

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg & Powers LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731